APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/979,810	11/25/97	ONO	T ASA-689

V. S

LM02/0205

FAY SHARPE BEALL FAGAN
MINNICH & MCKEE
104 EAST HUME AVENUE
ALEXANDRAI VA 22301

EXAMINER
MORGAN, G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2761	4

DATE MAILED: 02/05/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _Nov 28, 1996_ ⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯ .

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire ⎯⎯⎯ _3_ ⎯⎯⎯ month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

　☒ Claim(s) _1-28_ ⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯ is/are pending in the application.

　　Of the above, claim(s) ⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

　☐ Claim(s) ⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯ is/are allowed.

　☒ Claim(s) _1-28_ ⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯ is/are rejected.

　☐ Claim(s) ⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯ is/are objected to.

　☐ Claims ⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

　☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

　☐ The drawing(s) filed on ⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

　☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on ⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯ is ☐approved ☐disapproved.

　☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

　☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

　☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

　　☒ All ☐ Some* ☐ None　of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

　　　☒ received.

　　　☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) ⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯ .

　　　☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　*Certified copies not received: ⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯ .

　☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

　☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

　☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). ⎯⎯ _1_ ⎯⎯

　☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

　☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

　☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

DETAILED ACTION

1.   In an effort to maintain consistency with our customers, regarding issues related to the

Internet, the following language reflects the Office's definition of the term "Internet":

"Internet" refers to the global information system that -- (I) is logically linked together by a

globally unique address space based on the Internet Protocol (IP) or its subsequent extension/follow-

ons; (ii) is able to support communications using the Transmission Control Protocol/Internet

Protocol (TCP/IP) suite or its subsequent extensions/follow-ons, and/or other IP-compatible

protocols; (iii) provides, uses or makes accessible, either publicly or privately, high level services

layered on communications and related infrastructure.

Drawings

2.   The drawings are not objected to.

Specification

3.   The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of its undue length.   Correction is

required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

4.   Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a
separate sheet within the range of 50 to 250 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 250
words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer
is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said,"
should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in
deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

5.   The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

6.   The following title is suggested: "Electronic Commerce Order Tracking Method and Apparatus."

7.   The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

On page 31, line 10, the phraseology "Rivert-Shamir-Adleman (RAS)" should be changed to --Rivest-Shamir-Adleman (RSA)--.

Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9.   Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

10.   As per Claim 2, the language "outputting a warning message if erroneous conditions are included" is vague and indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

11.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States
> before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has
> fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof
> by the applicant for patent.

12.   Claims 15, 16, 23, 24, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated

by Camaisa et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,845263.

As per Claim 15, Camaisa discloses an electronic commerce support method for managing

trading in a server for providing a plurality of clients with electronic commerce services, comprising

the steps of:

receiving an order for a product in the electronic commerce in response to an input by a user

from a client through a communication network, and performing order acceptance processing for

said product in accordance with a predetermined electronic commerce processing [See col. 16, line

40 to col. 17, line 33 (Section VII.) describing remotely ordering of food over the Internet];

transmitting to said client trading information including a trading identifier associated with

said order and data on the contents of said order [see figure 14, "Order I.D."];

creating trading processing information including a present status of processing for

processing initiated for said order, a present status of processing for delivery of said product

corresponding to said order, a present status for processing for payment and transmitting said trading

processing information to said client [col. 16, line 65 to col. 17, line 8; "If the user selects Check

Order Status...the system moves to state 1308, Display Order Status Info. At state 1308, the system

can access an existing order by number or other means of identification and display the status of

any/all items in the selected order." A reasonable inference to be drawn from this is that "the status

of any/all items in the selected order" includes the status of processing, delivery, and payment--

inasmuch as the status of these items would typically be of utmost importance with respect to the

remote ordering of food]; and

managing the present status of processing for the processing initiated for said order, the

present status of the processing for delivery of said product corresponding to said order, and the

present status of processing for the payment processing for said trading until the order processing,

the delivery, and the payment processing are completed [col. 16, line 65 to col. 17, line 8].

Claims 23 and 27 are apparatus claims reciting the same limitations as Claim 15, and are

rejected for the same reasons.

As per Claim 16, Camaisa discloses the step of searching for the present status for the

processing for said order, the present status of the processing for delivery of said product

corresponding to payment processing for said trading, based on a trading identifier involved in a

request from a client, to create trading processing information, and transmitting said trading

processing information to said client [col. 16, line 65 to col. 17, line 8; "If the user selects Check

Order Status...the system moves to state 1308, Display Order Status Info. At state 1308, the system

can access an existing order by number or other means of identification and display the status of

any/all items in the selected order." A reasonable inference to be drawn from this is that "the status

of any/all items in the selected order" includes the status of <u>processing</u>, <u>delivery</u>, and <u>payment</u>--

inasmuch as the status of these items would typically be of utmost importance with respect to the

remote ordering of food. It is inherent that in order to access this information, searching for the

information would be required].

    Claim 24 is an apparatus claim reciting the same limitations as Claim 16, and is rejected for

the same reasons.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13.   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims

under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was

commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the

contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and

invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made

in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35

14.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section
> 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that
> the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having
> ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in
> which the invention was made.

15.   Claims 1, 3, 5, 17, 19, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Camaisa et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,845263.

As per Claim 1, Camaisa discloses an electronic commerce support method for managing

trading in a client connected to a server for providing electronic commerce services to receive the

electronic commerce services, comprising the steps of:

transmitting an order for a product on the electronic commerce in response to an input by a

user to said server through a communication network [See col. 16, line 40 to col. 17, line 33 (Section

VII.) describing remotely ordering of food over the Internet]; receiving trading information

including a trading identifier associated with said order [see figure 14, "Order I.D."] and data on the

contents of said order from said server [see figures 10-12 showing pictures of the food, ingredients,

nutritional information, and preparation], and storing said trading information in a storage device

[inherent in a computer system];

receiving from said server trading processing information including a present status of

processing for processing initiated for said order, a present status of processing for delivery of said

product corresponding to said order, a present status of processing for said trading, and the trading

identifier [col. 16, line 65 to col. 17, line 8; "If the user selects Check Order Status...the system

moves to state 1308, Display Order Status Info. At state 1308, the system can access an existing

order by number or other means of identification and display the status of any/all items in the

selected order." A reasonable inference to be drawn from this is that "the status of any/all items in

the selected order" includes the status of processing, delivery, and payment--inasmuch as the status

of these items would typically be of utmost importance with respect to the remote ordering of food];

and

comparing said trading identifier included in said trading information with said trading

identifier included in said trading processing information [Figure 5; col. 16, lines 52-54; discussing

the login procedure, which inherently requires such a comparison], and adding said trading

processing information to said trading information stored in said storage device if the are not

coincident [col. 16, line 65 to col. 17, line 8; as such, the information would have to be stored in a

computer system, e.g., main memory, DASD].

Camaisa does not expressly disclose outputting a warning if the trading identifiers are not

coincident. Official notice is taken that outputting warning messages when invalid information is

detected is old and well known in the computer arts. At the time the invention was made, it would

have been obvious to one skilled in the art to output a warning message if the trading identifiers are

not coincident. The motivation would have been to ensure that information be transmitted to users

having the proper authority to view such information.

Claims 17 and 25 are apparatus claims reciting the same limitations as Claim 1, and are

rejected for the same reasons.

As per Claim 3, Camaisa discloses the step of sending to said server a transmission request

for trading processing information including the trading identifier included in said trading

information received from said server in order to receive said trading processing information from

said server [col. 16, line 65 to col. 17, line 8; "If the user selects Check Order Status...the system

moves to state 1308, Display Order Status Info. At state 1308, the system can access an existing order by number or other means of identification and display the status of any/all items in the selected order." Also see Figure 14 ("Order I.D.")].

Claim 19 is an apparatus claim reciting the same limitations as Claim 3, and is rejected for the same reasons.

As per Claim 5, Camaisa discloses that the present status of processing for the processing for said order included in said trading processing information includes a delivery competed date or a scheduled delivery date for the product associated with said order, said present status of processing for said delivery includes a delivery completed date or a scheduled delivery date for said product, and said present status of processing for said payment processing includes a payment completed date or scheduled payment date [col. 16, line 65 to col. 17, line 8; "If the user selects Check Order Status...the system moves to state 1308, Display Order Status Info. At state 1308, the system can access an existing order by number or other means of identification and display the status of any/all items in the selected order." A reasonable inference to be drawn from this is that "the status of any/all items in the selected order" includes the status of the scheduled delivery date or completed delivery date, and payment completed date or scheduled payment date--inasmuch as the status of these items would typically be of utmost importance with respect to the remote ordering of food.

16.   Claims 2,18, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Camaisa

et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,845263, as applied to Claims 1, 3, 5, 17, 19, and 25 above, and further in

view of "*On the Fast Track with Total Track: UPS Deploys Mobile Data Service* (Towle)".

As per Claim 2, Camaisa does not disclose the step of comparing said data on the contents

of said order included in said trading information with said present status of processing for the

processing initiated for said order, said present status of processing for delivery of said product

corresponding to said order and said present status of processing for the payment processing for said

trading included in said trading processing information, and outputting a warning if erroneous

conditions are included. However, Towle teaches comparing said data on the contents of said order

included in said trading information with said present status of processing for the processing initiated

for said order, said present status of processing for delivery of said product corresponding to said

order [Towles discloses a software system used by UPS to track packages that not only determines

where a package is supposed to be but also where it actually is (page 2, col. 2, last full paragraph,

under heading "Smart Scanning". The system will notify persons (i.e., warn them), if the package

is shipped to the wrong destination.   Towles inherently teaches that the system compares the

"trading information" which would contain information as to where the package should have been

sent, to the present status -- actual delivery, and issues a warning if different].   It would have been

obvious to combine Towles with the method of Camaisa. The motivation would have been to

provide a means for warning a customer that the information he or she entered during order

processing was not being processed in accordance with the original order.

Claims 18 and 26 are apparatus claims reciting the same limitations as Claim 2, and are rejected for the same reasons.

17.   Claims 4 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Camaisa et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,845263, as applied to Claims 1, 3, 5, 17, 19, and 25 above, and further in view of Kehnemuyi et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,975,841.

As per Claim 4, Camaisa does not disclose that sending a request includes transmitting a time at which said trading processing information is to be received, together with said transmission request for said trading processing information. Kehnemuyi teaches transmitting a time at which trading processing information is to be received, together with the transmission request for the trading processing information [Figure 2; he discloses setting a predetermined time for automatically contacting customers with customer order status information. Abstr. "The customer order data includes product order information, scheduled and actual shipping dates and each customer's telephone number" Figure 1; Under Kehnemuyi, the predetermined time and request would be transmitted to a mainframe computer attached to a network of PC's. The mainframe would therefore be a "server"]. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Kehnemuyi with Camaisa method. The motivation would have been to provide customers with order status information on a regular, timely basis in order to proactively deal with problems that might arise with customer orders.

Claim 20 is an apparatus claim reciting the same limitations as Claim 4, and is rejected for the same reasons.

18.   Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Camaisa et

al., U.S. Patent No. 5,845263, as applied to Claims 1, 3, 5, 17, 19, and 25 above, and further in view

of "*On the Fast Track with Total Track: UPS Deploys Mobile Data Service* (Towle)" and applicant's

admitted prior art.

As per Claim 6, Camaisa does not disclose the step of displaying trading for which delivery

has been completed separately from trading for which delivery has not been completed, from said

present status of processing for delivery included in said trading information. Towle discloses

providing customers with updates on a shipment's status [page 2, col. 1, last fill paragraph;"For

immediate updates on a shipment's status, customers can call the Tracking Hotline." Page 2, col. last

full paragraph, describing how the system notifies customers if their delivery is "early, late, or routed

to the wrong destination" A reasonable inference could be drawn that the delivery status provided

by UPS would have included whether the package was delivered]. At at the time the invention was

made, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine Towles delivery status with

Camaisa. The motivation would have been to increase customer satisfaction and confidence.

Camaisa does not disclose displaying trading which have been settled separately from trading which

have not been settled, from said present status of processing for payment processing for said trading.

Applicant's admitted prior art discloses that credit card companies display information periodically

to their customers with respect to settled purchases [page 2, line 1 to page 3, line 20]. It would have

been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to include this information

separately, as per applicant's prior art, in combination with Camaisa. The motivation would have

been to provide information to the customer that he or she could use for household budget purposes.

As per Claim 7, Camaisa does not disclose calculating a total amount of money for products

included in said trading which have not been settled, and displaying the calculated total amount of

money. Official notice is taken that providing totals of amounts is old in the computer arts. It

would have been obvious to provide totals of the non-settled amounts, in combination with Camaisa.

The motivation would have been to provide information to the customer that he or she could use

for household budget purposes.

19.   Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Camaisa et al., U.S.

Patent No. 5,845263, as applied to Claims 1, 3, 5, 17, 19, and 25 above, in view of *"On the Fast*

Track with Total Track: UPS Deploys Mobile Data Service (Towle)" and applicant's admitted prior

art, and further in view of Fukushima et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,799,289.

As per Claim 8, Camaisa does not disclose the step of comparing the total amount of money

with a predetermined limit amount, and outputting a warning if the total amount of money for the

products included in the trading which have not been settled exceeds the limit amount. Fukushima

teaches an order management system in which ordering is permitted when the calculated total cost

is within a budget of the orderer [col. 1, line 41 to col. 2, line 8]. Under Fukushima, a warning

message is output if the budget is exceeded [Figure 9, at Ref. No. 9]. It would have been obvious

to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Fukushima's budget limit

warning with Camaisa. The motivation would have been to provide information to the customer that he or she could use for household budget purposes.

20.   Claims 9, 10, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Camaisa et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,845263, as applied to Claims 1, 3, 5, 17, 19, and 25 above, and further in view of *"Frontiers of Electronic Commerce* (Kalakoda et al.)"*.

As per Claim 9, Camaisa does not disclose inputting information on a product to be returned in said displayed trading information to which said trading processing information has been added, and transmitting said information to said server. Kalakoda teaches that inputting information on a product to be returned is an important part of electronic purchasing [page 287, under heading "Postpurchase Interaction"; "As long as there is payment for services, there will be refunds, disputes, and other customer services issues that need to be considered....To compound the problem, most companies design their mercantile processes for one-way merchandise flow: outbound to the customer. That means returns and claims must flow upstream, against the current, creating logistical messes and transactional snarls--and extremely dissatisfied customers."]. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Kalakoda's product return feature into Camaisa. The motivation would have been to increase customer satisfaction.

As per Claim 10, Camaisa does not disclose displaying the trading information to select a portion of information from the trading information, creating new order information by modifying the selected information, and transmitting the new order information to the server. Kalakoda teaches

modifying selected information, and transmitting the new order information to a server [See

discussion under Claim 9. When a customer requests a refund or wishes to return the product, this

is seen to be modifying the order information]. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art

at the time the invention was made to incorporate Kalakoda's order modification feature into

Camaisa. The motivation would have been to increase customer satisfaction.

Claim 22 is an apparatus claim reciting the same limitations as Claim 10, and is rejected for

the same reasons.

21.   Claims 11-14, 21, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Camaisa et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,845263, as applied to Claims 1, 3, 5, 17, 19, and 25 above, in view

of Cameron, U.S. Patent No. 5,592,378.

As per Claim 11, Camaisa does not disclose that the server includes a shopping server

dedicated to sales of products in the electronic commerce, a payment managing server dedicated to

payment processing for said sales of products in response to an instruction from said shopping

server, and a delivery managing server dedicated to delivery processing in said sales of products in

response to an instruction from said shopping server, and said trading information includes

destination addresses of said shopping server, said payment managing server, and said delivery

managing server, said method further comprising the steps of: receiving said present status of

processing for said order from said shopping server; receiving said present status of processing for

said payment processing for trading from said payment managing server.   Cameron teaches a

computerized order entry system with all these elements [col. 13, line 41; his "Order Capture

Module" is applicant's shopping server; col. 10, line 61; his "Billing Module" is applicant's payment

managing server; col. 18, line 11; his "Shipping Module" is applicant's delivery managing server].

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine

Cameron with Camaisa. The motivation would have been to provide an efficient architecture in

which commonly executed tasks are executed on distinct servers.

Claim 21 is an apparatus claim reciting the same limitations as Claim 11, and is rejected for

the same reasons.

As per Claim 12, Camaisa does not disclose sending to a shopping server a transmission

request for order processing information including a trading identifier included in said trading

information received from the shopping server in order to receive the present status of processing

for the order from the shopping server. Camaisa does disclose sending a server a trading identifier,

and receiving from the server the present status of a shopping order [col. 16, line 65 to col. 17, line

8; "If the user selects Check Order Status...the system moves to state 1308, Display Order Status

Info. At state 1308, the system can access an existing order by number or other means of

identification and display the status of any/all items in the selected order."]. Cameron discloses an

order entry system with a shopping server [col. 13, line 41; his "Order Capture Module" is

applicant's shopping server]. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine Cameron with Camaisa in such a manner. The motivation would

have been to provide an efficient means to obtain order status information.

As per Claim 13, Camaisa does not disclose sending to a payment managing server a transmission request for payment managing processing information including the trading identifier included in the trading information received from the shopping server in order to receive the present status of processing for the payment processing for trading from the payment managing server. Camaisa does disclose sending a server a trading identifier, and receiving from the server the present status of payment processing [col. 16, line 65 to col. 17, line 8; "If the user selects Check Order Status...the system moves to state 1308, Display Order Status Info. At state 1308, the system can access an existing order by number or other means of identification and display the status of any/all items in the selected order." A reasonable inference to be drawn from this is that "the status of any/all items in the selected order" includes the status of payment--inasmuch as the status of this item would typically be of utmost importance with respect to the remote ordering of food]. Cameron discloses an order entry system with a payment managing server [col. 10, line 61; his "Billing Module" is applicant's payment managing server]. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Cameron with Camaisa in such a manner. The motivation would have been to provide an efficient means to obtain payment status information.

As per Claim 14, Camaisa does not disclose sending to a delivery managing server a transmission request for delivery managing processing information including the trading identifier included in the trading information received from the shopping server in order to receive the present status of processing for the delivery from the delivery managing server. Camaisa does disclose

sending a server a trading identifier, and receiving from the server the present status of delivery [col. 16, line 65 to col. 17, line 8; "If the user selects Check Order Status...the system moves to state 1308, Display Order Status Info. At state 1308, the system can access an existing order by number or other means of identification and display the status of any/all items in the selected order." A reasonable inference to be drawn from this is that "the status of any/all items in the selected order" includes the status of delivery--inasmuch as the status of this item would typically be of utmost importance with respect to the remote ordering of food]. Cameron discloses an order entry system with a delivery managing server [col. 18, line 11; his "Shipping Module" is applicant's delivery managing server] It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Cameron with Camaisa in such a manner. The motivation would have been to provide an efficient means to obtain delivery status information.

As per Claim 28, Camaisa discloses a storage medium having an electronic commerce support program provided in a shopping server for providing electronic commerce services to a plurality of clients, said program being readable by a CPU in said shopping server for managing trading, said storage medium comprising:

a storage component having a code sequence for realizing the step of receiving an order for a product on the electronic commerce from a client in response to an input by a user through a communication network, and performing order acceptance processing for said product in accordance with a predetermined electronic commerce processing [See col. 16, line 40 to col. 17, line 33 (Section VII.) describing remotely ordering of food over the Internet];

a storage component having a code sequence for realizing the step of transmitting to said

client trading information including a trading identifier associated with said order and data on the

contents of said order [see figure 14, "Order I.D."]; and

a storage component having a code sequence for realizing the step of transmitting to said

client a present status of processing for processing initiated for said order [col. 16, line 65 to col. 17,

line 8; "If the user selects Check Order Status...the system moves to state 1308, Display Order Status

Info. At state 1308, the system can access an existing order by number or other means of

identification and display the status of any/all items in the selected order."].

Camaisa does not expressly disclose a storage component having a code sequence for

realizing the step of transmitting a request for delivery of said product corresponding to said order

to a delivery managing server connected to said shopping server; and a storage component having

a code sequence for realizing the step of transmitting a request for payment processing for said

trading to a payment managing server. Cameron teaches a storage component having a code

sequence for realizing the step of transmitting a request for delivery of a product corresponding to

the order to a delivery managing server connected to a shopping server; and a storage component

having a code sequence for realizing the step of transmitting a request for payment processing for

said trading to a payment managing server [col. 13, line 41; his "Order Capture Module" is

applicant's shopping server; col. 10, line 61; his "Billing Module" is applicant's payment managing

server; col. 18, line 11; his "Shipping Module" is applicant's delivery managing server]. It would

have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Cameron

with Camaisa. The motivation would have been to provide an efficient architecture in which commonly executed tasks are executed on distinct servers.

References Cited

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

. Cameron et al (5,832,459) disclose a computerized source searching system and method for the placement of an order.

Brown et al. (4,972,318) disclose a method of order entry, product selection and inventory control for building products.

Hartheimer et al (5,305,200) disclose a distributed processing on-line automated securities trading system.

Lupien et al (5,101,353) disclose an automated system for managing one or more large investor portfolios.

Schrader et al (5,649,115) disclose a tracking method and apparatus that includes a wallet metaphor for tracking customer purchases.

PC Week (July 1, 1996) discloses that Federal Express had a Web site that allows customers to track packages.

Information Today (Nov/Dec 1995) discloses that Federal Express opened a "store" on the CompuServe's Electronic Mall that offerred 24-hour package status tracking, plus many other services for business and residential customers.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George Morgan whose telephone number is (703) 306-2906. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Todd Voeltz, can be reached on (703) 305-9714. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-5358.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

January 24, 1999

EMANUEL TODD VOELTZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2700